

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicants submit a replacement sheet and an annotated sheet of Figure 9 (appended hereto) for approval by the Examiner in accordance with MPEP § 608.02(v). The proposed replacement sheet is submitted to comply with the Examiner's request to label the paths emanating from block 254 and to clarify blocks 242 and 244.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application. Claims 1, 13, and 21 are amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, 16, 18, and 20-22 are presented for examination.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) on the basis of failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Examiner refers to "the trace of microinstruction comprising a head entry, the head entry comprising a linear address to determine a set of subsequent entries in the trace" as recited in claims 1, 13, and 21. Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to page 14 of the specification as filed. In this section, the specification describes that in one embodiment, a trace of microinstructions may only be entered through a "head" entry that includes a linear address that determines a set of subsequent entries of the trace event stored in successive sets. Now turning to Figure 6, there is a drawing of a trace cache. Entry 0 is an example of the head entry and, "Entry 1, Entry 2, ... Entry 255" is an example of the linear address that determines a set of subsequent entries in the trace. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the objection to the drawings to be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Examiner further objects to Figure 9 on the basis that Figure 9 and the specification disclose something different from the claims. In particular, the Examiner refers to "if the qualitative determination is to retain the first microinstruction, then advancing the write point ... if the qualitative determination is not to retain the first microinstruction, then maintain the write pointer" as recited in claims 1, 13, and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that on page 22 of the specification, in lines 11-21, it is described that the write pointer will proceed to the entry following the last valid microinstruction in that set. A new set of microinstructions will be written at the end of the previous set if the previous set contained a full complement of valid instructions, or overwrite the invalid entries. Applicants respectfully submit that the description stated in the specification is consistent with the claim language and that which is depicted in Figure 9.

Figure 9 has been amended to include labels "YES" and "NO" for the paths emanating from block 254. Furthermore, Figure 9 has been amended to indicate "Read next set (e.g. 6) upos

from trace cache at first clk frequency (e.g., C)” at operation 242 and “Write next set (e.g. 6) upon commencing at a location within FIFO queue indicated by write pointer” at operation 244. These amendments are supported by the Applicants’ specification as filed on page 22, lines 8-10.

In view of at least the previous reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, 16, 18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Independent claims 1, 13, and 21 are amended. The amendments were made according to the Examiner’s recommendation made on page 5 of the Office Action mailed February 8, 2006. The claim limitations introduce that a first microinstruction includes a valid state and an invalid state. Further more the claim limitations introduce that a qualitative decision is made based on the valid or the invalid state of the first microinstruction.

Dependent claims 2, 4, 6-12, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 22 are dependent from the independent claims respectively and therefore incorporate the amendments made herein.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims, 2, 4, 6-14, 16, 18, and 20-22 under 35. U.S.C. § 112.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, 16, 18, and 20-22 are not rejected substantively. Therefore, it is inferred that the Examiner recognizes the claims are allowable. Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner’s inferred indication that claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, 16, 18, and 20-22 contain allowable subject matter.



CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing, it is believed that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Questions regarding this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 5/5/06

Thomas Coester

Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
Telephone (310) 207-3800
Facsimile (310) 820-5988

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Suzanne Johnston

Date

5/5/06



ANNOTATED SHEET

